



BOSTON COLLEGE

JUN - - 1989

PROPERTY OF O'NEILL LIBRARY

STUDIES

in the Spirituality of Jesuits

Jesuits and Peacemaking: A Symposium

by

William C. Spohn, S.J.

John A. Coleman, S.J.

Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.

Peter J. Henriot, S.J.



Published by the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality,
especially for American Jesuits working out their *aggiornamento*
in the spirit of Vatican Council II

THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

consists of a group of Jesuits from various provinces who are listed below. The members were appointed by the Fathers Provincial of the United States.

The Purpose of the Seminar is to study topics pertaining to the spiritual doctrine and practice of Jesuits, especially American Jesuits, and to communicate the results to the members of the Assistancy. The hope is that this will lead to further discussion among all American Jesuits--in private, or in small groups, or in community meetings. All this is done in the spirit of Vatican Council II's recommendation to religious institutes to recapture the original charismatic inspiration of their founders and to adapt it to the changed circumstances of modern times. The members of the Seminar welcome reactions or comments in regard to the topics they publish.

To achieve these purposes, especially amid today's pluralistic cultures, the Seminar must focus its direct attention sharply, frankly, and specifically on the problems, interests, and opportunities of the Jesuits of the United States. However, many of these interests are common also to Jesuits of other regions, or to other priests, religious men or women, or to lay men or women. Hence the Studies of the Seminar, while meant especially for American Jesuits, are not exclusively for them. Others who may find them helpful are cordially welcome to read them.

THE MEMBERS OF THE SEMINAR ARE;

- Charles J. Beirne, S.J., College of Business Administration, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., 20057. 202-625-0100
- Gregory I. Carlson, S.J., Marquette Jesuit Residence, 1404 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233. 414-344-7900
- Philip C. Fischer, S.J., Secretary of the Seminar, Fusz Memorial, 3700 West Pine Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63108. 314-652-3700
- George E. Ganss, S.J., Chairman of the Assistancy Seminar and Editor of its Studies. His address: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, Fusz Memorial, 3700 West Pine Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63108. 314-652-5737.
- Donald L. Gelpi, S.J., Jesuit School of Theology, 1735 LeRoy Avenue, Berkeley, California 94709. 415-841-8804.
- E. Edward Kinerk, S.J., Jesuit Novitiate, 1901 Eudora Street, Denver, Colorado 80220. 303-320-6297
- Brian O. McDermott, S.J., Weston Jesuit Community, 20 Sumner Road, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. 617-547-3742
- Leo J. O'Donovan, S.J., Weston School of Theology, 3 Phillips Place, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. 617-547-3742
- William C. Spohn, S.J., Jesuit School of Theology, 1735 LeRoy Avenue, Berkeley, California 94709. 415-841-9121
- John M. Staudenmaier, S.J., University of Detroit, 4001 McNichols Road, Detroit, Michigan 48221. 617-927-1000
- L. John Topel, S.J. Jesuit Novitiate, 3301 S. E. 45th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97206. 503-774-5699

STUDIES

in the Spirituality of Jesuits

Jesuits and Peacemaking: A Symposium

by

William C. Spohn, S.J.

John A. Coleman, S.J.

Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.

Peter J. Henriot, S.J.



**Published by the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality,
especially for American Jesuits working out their aggiornamento
in the spirit of Vatican Council II**

CONTENTS

JESUITS AND PEACEMAKING: A SYMPOSIUM

I. INTRODUCTION	
by William C. Spohn, S.J., Coordinator of the Symposium	1
II. THE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE PASTORAL LETTER AND IGNATIAN CONTEMPLATION	
by William C. Spohn, S.J.	3
A. Nuclear Conscience and Scripture	3
B. The Ministry of Reconciliation	4
C. Ignatian Contemplation and Peacemaking	8
III. <i>SENTIRE CUM ECCLESIA</i> : JESUITS AND THE CHURCH'S TRADITION OF NONVIOLENCE AND JUST WAR	
by John A. Coleman, S.J.	11
A. The Mutual Complementarity of the Two Traditions	12
1. <i>Sentire cum Ecclesia</i>	13
2. Responses to the Bishops' Pastoral Exemplify the Need for <i>Sentire cum Ecclesia</i>	14
B. Morality and Spirituality	16

CONTENTS (continued)

IV. JESUIT PEACEMAKING IN THE AFTERMATH OF THREE GENERAL CONGREGATIONS

by Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.	21
A. The 32nd General Congregation	21
1. Nothing to Say	22
2. Something to Say	23
3. Everything to Say	24
B. The 31st General Congregation	27
C. The 33rd General Congregation	29

V. CALLED TO BE PEACEMAKERS: LIVING WITH TENSIONS IN THE ACTIVE MINISTRY

by Peter J. Henriot, S.J.	33
A. Motivation	36
1. Guilt or Responsibility	36
2. Anger or Love	36
B. Guidance	37
3. Fear or Risk	37
4. Respectability or Authenticity	38
5. Paralysis or Engagement	39
C. Evaluation	40
6. Success or Hope	40
D. Conclusion	40
Endnotes	42
CHECKLISTS: Publications of the INSTITUTE OF JESUIT SOURCES	44
and of the AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR	47



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/jesuitspeacemaki174spoh>

JESUITS AND PEACEMAKING: A SYMPOSIUM

I. INTRODUCTION

by

William C. Spohn, S.J.
Jesuit School of Theology
1735 LeRoy Avenue
Berkeley, California 94709

In May of 1983 the Catholic bishops of the United States issued their pastoral letter on the nuclear-arms crisis, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*. In it they called upon Catholic educators to help form the conscience of Americans to decide how to become peacemakers. This issue of *Studies* considers the role that Jesuits can play in responding to that invitation. We present the reflections of four American Jesuits who have discovered guidance in Ignatian spirituality for coming to moral clarity and helping others to respond in this "moment of supreme crisis" (*Challenge of Peace*, paragraph 4). We hope that their experiences will encourage other ministers to read the signs of the times and discover God's call to move our world closer to peace.

John A. Coleman, S.J., professor of Christian Social Ethics in the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, describes our cooperation with the bishops as a contemporary application of that attitude of loving loyalty urged by St. Ignatius in his Rules for Thinking with the Church (*Spiritual Exercises*, [352-370]).

Thomas E. Clarke, S.J., who writes and lectures widely from his home base in New York City, sees the nuclear question in light of the call from recent Jesuit General Congregations to integrate the service of faith and the promotion of justice. He was a delegate from the New York Province to the 32nd General Congregation.

Peter J. Henriot, S.J., a political scientist who was a delegate from the Oregon Province to the 33rd General Congregation and is currently Director of the Center of Concern in Washington, D.C., treats of the tensions, often not fully resolvable, which those who participate in the work of peacemaking experience.

The present writer, professor of Moral Theology in the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, has been the coordinator in the gathering and revising of the other authors' papers and offers his own reflections on the biblical theology of the pastoral letter and Ignatian contemplation.

The members of the Seminar, who also form the editorial board of these *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, express their special gratitude to Mr. Patrick H. O'Liddy, S.J., a member of the Missouri Province now teaching at St. Louis University High School. He initiated this project, suggested it to the Seminar, and first solicited the various contributions.

II. THE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE PASTORAL LETTER AND IGNATIAN CONTEMPLATION

by William C. Spohn, S.J.

How can we find hope and moral guidance pertaining to the nuclear threat from documents that are at least two thousand years old? In *The Challenge of Peace* the United States bishops do not look to Scripture for specific solutions to the arms race or nuclear deterrence. Instead of looking for moral principles to act upon, they look to Scripture to refashion our hearts and imaginations. They outline a theology of peace from Old and New Testaments which provides "urgent directions" for action while leaving practical decision to individuals. This approach offers a richer appreciation of Scripture than using it as a source of moral norms alone. First, let us look at the theology of peace in the letter. Then let us turn to Ignatian contemplation from the *Exercises* as a method of making biblical stories and imagery practical on the nuclear question.

A. Nuclear Conscience and Scripture

When giving lectures on the pastoral letter to a variety of audiences, I noticed a curious reaction to the document. The biblical material in the letter speaks more deeply to most people than does the philosophical analysis of nuclear deterrence. The letter devotes nearly five times more space to just-war theory than to the theology of peace. The public press concentrated on this policy analysis but largely ignored the biblical section; most clergy and laity reading the letter took the opposite approach.

I found in addition that both teachers in Catholic schools and parish ministers were reluctant to speak on the nuclear question. They were paralyzed by fear of appearing partisan or simply incompetent on such a complex issue as arms control. The prospect of criticism from engineers and military personnel in the pews effectively silenced them. Once these same teachers and pastors came to appreciate the rich biblical spirituality in the letter, they became more willing to exercise moral leadership. In two separate clergy workshops, bishops urged their priests and parish ministers to claim the authority of the gospel and speak a message of hope on this frightening subject. The bishops stressed that pastoral ministers are competent to present a Christian vision of peace, even though they are rarely experts

on the technical details of nuclear armaments.

Support came for this pastoral approach from a quarter that surprised me--from professors in secular universities, many of whom were non-Christian or agnostic. They did not expect pastors to dictate political solutions to the arms race, but they did recognize that only religion could address an evil of such enormity. Their own disciplines of political science, physics, and the like were overtaxed by the possibility of the destruction of life on this planet by human fear and enmity. They knew that as academicians they could not address such ultimate questions; nevertheless, they hoped that religious people might shed some light on them.

The biblical symbols and stories provide imaginative ways to consider life and death, war and human malice. They also challenge our attitudes towards our enemies and our national allegiances. Scripture may not dictate a strategy of action, but it does call believers to reflect and pray on the meaning of global nuclear balance of terror. The bishops wrote, "We must probe the meaning of the moral choices which are ours as Christians" (par. 67).

We cannot derive our options *as Christians* simply from moral philosophy or natural law. We discover our option in faith by going to the sources of that faith, to the person of Jesus Christ and the witness of Scripture. How we act must be consonant with who we are. Theology can remind us of our true identity, and that sets the framework in our search for meaning on this complex question. Whatever option individual Catholics may take on the arms race, it must be compatible with three theological foundations: (1) Christ intended to reconcile all people with God and one another; (2) as his disciples, Christians must continue this work of reconciliation through the community of his Body; and (3) the messianic peace of Christ has already begun but is not yet fulfilled. Together, these three convictions direct Christian peacemaking in the nuclear age.

B. The Ministry of Reconciliation

The logic of discipleship, so familiar from the *Exercises*, brings the appeal within *The Challenge of Peace* into focus. A true biblical theology of peace centers on the person of Jesus Christ and his call to us to become faithful disciples. His mission was primarily one of reconciliation; therefore, those who would follow him as disciples must become reconcilers in their own time. The call of Christ leads us to become peacemakers between

hostile groups and nations, because Christ's peace goes beyond inner tranquillity. As we read the signs of our times, this reconciling work becomes urgent. Living under the cloud of nuclear extinction, we can appreciate that "the moral issue at stake in nuclear war involves the meaning of sin in its most graphic dimensions" (123). Therefore, this ministry of reconciliation must go on in the sociopolitical arena.

The *Exercises* follow the same logic of discipleship as they find the norm for our way of life in the personal qualities of Jesus. The Master summons disciples into his own struggle and mission. He does not ask them to face anything he has not faced; nor does he disguise the cost of discipleship. The retreatant gradually identifies with the person of Christ through the successive contemplations of the Second, Third, and Fourth Weeks. These contemplations highlight the qualities of humility and poverty combined with a great zeal to win back people to God. Our individual election must be consonant with these qualities and this mission. Discipleship, however, does not only look for marching orders; this way of life promises intimate friendship with the Master. As the Kingdom meditation insists at the beginning of the contemplations on the life of Christ, we come to know the Lord when we share his mission and struggles. If we are his companions in labor and humiliations, we will come to know him more intimately. If we shy away from the service, we also shy away from any depth of companionship. The disciple finds enthusiasm for the ministry and even for the cross because only there can the disciple abide with the Master.

The pastoral letter emphasizes reconciliation as the central task for disciples in our culture. Those who follow the path of Jesus the peacemaker will come to know who He is intimately. The vocation to peacemaking cannot be a temporary strategy because it lies at the heart of Jesus' mission, and so too at the heart of his disciples' way of life. This Christology of reconciliation must interpret any particular text of Scripture, thereby preventing us from using any biblical injunction in a partisan fashion. The pacifist may insist that "turning the other cheek" obliges all Christians literally, while the advocates of military force may absolutize the example of Jesus cleansing the temple. The letter rules out such "proof-text" use of Scripture because the bishops argue that any text must be read in light of the vocation to peacemaking that flows from the person of Jesus Christ.

The New Testament also instructs us on how we are to seek this universal

reconciliation. The story of Jesus shows the dispositions of the heart necessary for Christian peacemaking. His preaching of forgiveness reverses the logic of vengeance. The reign of God rests on love, "an active, life-giving, inclusive force" (47). Although the final draft of the letter omits the earlier language of nonviolence, Jesus' attitude of nonretaliation is clear. He defended the rights of others but did not insist on his own: "In all his sufferings, as in all of his life and ministry, Jesus refused to defend himself with force or violence" (49). The culminating event of Jesus' mission also proclaims his ministry of reconciliation. On the cross he abolished the enmity between humanity and God and simultaneously reconciled humanity. He becomes our peace, the one "who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility" (Eph. 2:14).

Paul could appropriately sum up our vocation as "the ministry of reconciliation," because we act as Christ's ambassadors, urging all to move from enmity to friendship with God and one another (2 Cor. 5:20). We make this appeal primarily as a community of disciples who know that we will experience the same resistance that Jesus did. "As disciples and children of God, it is our task to seek for ways in which to make the forgiveness, justice and mercy and love of God visible in a world where violence and enmity are too often the norm" (55). Thus Scripture develops certain orientations, certain habits of the heart, that make us ready to act as Christ did. The Scriptures "provide us with an urgent direction when we look at today's concrete realities" (55). Since Christ overcame evil through forgiveness, his disciples have the same mandate.

The hierarchy has not often taught with such direct appeal to discipleship. Although they make lengthy arguments from the just-war tradition to appeal to the larger community of conscience, they make an appeal to the community of faith that is strongly biblical. They portray a world that does not function simply on the principles of natural law instilled at creation. This world they describe lies open to God's intervention in matters of war and peace, as the biblical witness insists. God knows about the threat to his creation posed by our weapons, and God is capable of doing something about it. Their prophetic call to halt the arms race needs to be compared to the voice of the Old Testament prophets. They do not speak on their own behalf.

Finally, the bishops extend the spirituality of discipleship to the

entire Church. We should note a new turn in ecclesial self-understanding here. John Paul II has begun to speak of the Church as "a community of disciples" that can expect no better treatment than its Master received. The bishops warn us that we can no longer presume that the gospel and the American way of life fit together with ease. Perhaps only an American church which no longer worries about being immigrants can be so forthright with its members. "We readily recognize that we live in a world that is becoming increasingly estranged from Christian values. In order to remain a Christian, one must take a resolute stand against many commonly accepted axioms of the world . . . To set out on the road to discipleship is to dispose oneself for a share in the cross" (277, 276). The bishops link a spirituality of discipleship with their Christology of reconciliation. A society that is growing increasingly more defensive and militarized will not welcome a church of peacemakers, and that church needs to be forewarned,

A third biblical theme shows the need for both pacifists and just-war advocates to coexist in the same community. The bishops are saying that the Church needs both groups, even if we cannot follow their opposite recommendations. Both sides witness the tension involved in peacemaking. *Already* we experience that reconciliation has been accomplished in Christ; the pacifist insists on this. The advocates of justifiable defense witness to the other side of the truth, namely, that because we live in a world of sin, the promise of peace is *not yet* fulfilled. "Already . . . but not yet" expresses the tension of all the prophets' promises, the paradox between the vision and the sinful situation. The Church cannot afford to ignore either element in this paradox. "We must continue to articulate the belief that love is possible and the only real hope for all human relations, and yet accept that force, even deadly force, is sometimes justified and that nations must provide for their defense" (78). Nevertheless, the bishops contend that those who seek nonviolent means of resolving conflicts best express the example of Christ (see 78). While the bishops' concern to keep both pacifists and just-war advocates in dialogue may be admirable, one wonders whether the tension between the two positions may be more extreme than they envision. Does the "right to self-defense" have equal theological standing with the call to follow the nonresistance and forgiveness of Jesus? Must the moral obligation to defend the innocent be met with tactics that conform to Jesus' tactics in overcoming evil by suffering rather than

retaliation? These tensions have persisted in Christian thought on warfare since Augustine. *The Challenge of Peace* does not resolve them.

C. Ignatian Contemplation and Peacemaking

I want to suggest in this final section that the logic of Christian discipleship works through the imagination and that Ignatian contemplation of the Scriptures can engender discipleship in us. In our own tradition we possess an invaluable resource for peacemaking. Although we may find it curious to apply a method of prayer to social issues and political options, contemplation of the gospel may be the missing link between faith and concrete action against nuclear war. Recently, one of our students at the Jesuit School of Theology published a book that applies Ignatian contemplation to peacemaking. Denise Priestley was writing her M.A. thesis while pregnant with her second child. She had some familiarity with Ignatian spirituality through Christian Life Community experience and had been active in the peace movement. She describes the ominous fears that being pregnant in the nuclear age stirred up:

Giving birth to a child appears today to be an utterly hopeless act. Indeed, giving birth to life in any way--through work for justice, through art, through social service, through ministry--can appear, in the face of the absence of any future, to be ultimately futile. Often I am asked the difficult question: How can I choose to bring children into such a world overshadowed by death? (from *Bringing Forth in Hope*, Paulist Press: 1983, p. 4).

She went to Scripture both to face these fears and doubts and to find some words of hope. In the story of the woman in Revelation 12 who was about to bring forth a child but knew that the dragon waited to devour it, she found a symbol of both her fears and her hope. By entering into the story of God's deliverance of that woman and her child, she caught echoes of God's faithfulness in her own seemingly desperate situation. She expanded that consolation into a theology of Christian hope and motherhood that has since been an inspiration to thousands of young families.

Ignatius directs the contemplations of the *Exercises* to a felt identification with the characters of biblical stories. As we tangibly and visually move into their narrated encounter with the Lord, we find in ourselves some echo of their response: If Peter could be forgiven, so can I. If the father could welcome home the prodigal son, then my fears of God's anger are without foundation. We learn to "ask for what we want" in these contemplations by

the example of these characters in the story. They raise our expectations and open us to hear the Lord's word to us today. Ignatius also attempted to help us acknowledge our disordered affections and desires and use our imagination to identify where our own temptations and discouragement originate. In other words, our imagination helps us to feel and acknowledge both our fears and the hope engendered by the Spirit.

What Denise Priestley did with her fears and the text of Revelation follows this Ignatian method of contemplation. She identified with the woman's terror before she identified with the woman's joy at deliverance. Perhaps part of the impact of grace must be to illumine the very terror which we suppress, the fear that we cannot name of utter extinction through nuclear war. Without naming that fear we walk around in a state of "psychic numbness" that blots out any perception of our danger. Just as Ignatius vividly portrays the experience of hell in the First Week so that we can pray through fear to repentance and hope, other images of Scripture can help us to allow the "disordered affections" of our deepest consciousness to surface so that they may be healed by grace. Spiritual directors are skilled at helping us acknowledge buried memories and unspoken anxieties. Yet often we restrict such an examen of consciousness to personal problems. What if some of our personal fears and despair are caused by the threat of nuclear annihilation or world hunger? Ignatian contemplation may uncover these social terrors and help us find courage to confront the powers that hold us enthralled. This form of prayer can also lead to a discernment about what to do politically to alter the politics and economics of the arms race.

Mark Twain once wrote that history does not repeat itself, but it does rhyme. Ignatian contemplation trains us in spotting the "rhyme," the similarities that exist between biblical stories and our own times. Those trained in this form of prayer can help others to recognize God in the signs of the times, even in the nuclear threat. We can assist others in "finding God in all things," not only in private experience but in political matters as well. The stories and symbols of Scripture, even such an arcane one as the pregnant woman in Revelation 12, offer us lenses through which we can scrutinize our world. Scholarship is needed to interpret these stories and symbols, but it cannot exhaust their potential. Prayer must supplement scholarship and bring us into the world of Jesus and the "mind of Jesus" into our world (see 1 Cor. 2). Then the story of Jesus begins to interpret us,

to illumine our world with hope. The bishops affirm the foundation of that hope in "the confidence that the risen Lord remains with us precisely in moments of crisis" (viii). In order to move from the memory of God's intervention in the past to our crisis, we need to spot the analogy between those situations and our own. Ignatian contemplation can train our imaginations to catch the "rhyme" that can be revelatory for us today.

The biblical theology of peace must be supplemented by means of prayer that can enable it to come alive. Those trained in Ignatian spirituality can offer the Church in the United States a disciplined skill of seeking God in all things, even in the nuclear threat that overshadows us all.

III. SENTIRE CUM ECCLESIA: JESUITS AND THE CHURCH'S TRADITION OF NONVIOLENCE AND JUST WAR

by

John A. Coleman, S.J.
Jesuit School of Theology
1735 LeRoy Avenue
Berkeley, California 94709

In discussing this pastoral, I ask that you teach and emphasize primarily what the bishops taught in the letter. Only afterwards teach your own commentaries. The bishops' pastoral represents a striking consensus document for the American church. Some months before it was accepted the American bishops entertained genuine fears that no single statement could command a majority vote in the bishops' conference and elicit the consent of people as diverse as Juneau's Bishop Michael Kenny, a pacifist, and just-war advocates such as New York's Cardinal Cooke. That this document won the nearly unanimous support of the entire American episcopacy should not be treated lightly. Even if at some points its position is based on a minimal consensus, it represents the maximum present possibilities for the American Catholic Church to unite on a common agenda, with shared presuppositions, in order to face the gravest moral evil of our generation. Remember, too, that it will take at least a generation of undivided commitment by American Catholics to address and reverse the nuclear arms race.

The bishop of Oakland, California, John Cummins, in a homily at a liturgy concluding a two-day symposium on the American bishops' peace pastoral, made this plea to the theological community in Berkeley. Bishop Cummins' comments strike me as a remarkable contemporary restatement of one important aspect of the Ignatian Rules for Thinking with the Church as applied to the issues of war and peace in our time.

In this brief essay I shall be guided by the Ignatian rules, while considering the Church's tradition of nonviolence and just war. In my judgment, the most strikingly original moral claim in the bishops' pastoral on peace is the alleged mutual complementarity of the just-war and pacifist traditions. Ignatius' rules may give us an invaluable clue for moving towards a possible consensus between these two traditions. I also suggest that we take as a locus for testing this moral claim of the bishops the arena of a spirituality for peacemaking. Our greatest obstacle in doing this lies in the fact that, at present, just-war modes of moral thinking lack any appropriate spirituality for sustained peacemaking. As I will suggest, they even lack the essential vocabulary which bridges ethics and spirituality.

Catholic pacifists and just-war advocates frequently find it difficult to find common cause together. Sometimes they even seem eager to read each other out of the one Church. Over the years, in courses concerned with the moral issues of war and peace, I have myself alternately felt a tug to agree intellectually and morally with the just-war tradition and then a strong sense that nonviolent resistance contains the more coherent and authentically Christian position. Nor has this inner debate been purely intellectual. During the Vietnam War, when I counseled selective conscientious objectors at the University of Santa Clara or worked with Clergy and Laity United, I did so exclusively on just-war premises. More recently I define myself as a pacifist. As I would account for it, my own journey from the one to the other came from trying to find a spirituality for peace that promised integrity between the quality and character of my person and actions of nonviolent civil disobedience.

A. The Mutual Complementarity of the Two Traditions?

In this essay I will not attempt to change anyone's thinking on either just war or pacifism. Nor will I render an explicit intellectual account of how I changed personally to become a nonviolent resister. Rather, I want to point to a striking restatement of Catholic thought that is contained in the bishops' pastoral letter, "The Challenge of Peace." Paragraphs 120-121 present the bishops' proposal for relating nonviolence and just-war:

While the just-war thinking has clearly been in possession for the past 1,500 years of Catholic thought, the new moment in which we find ourselves sees the just-war teaching and non-violence as distinct but interdependent methods of evaluating warfare. They diverge on some specific conclusions but they share a common presumption against the use of force as a means of settling disputes.

Both find their roots in the Christian theological tradition; each contributes to the full moral vision we need to pursue a human peace. We believe the two perspectives support and complement one another, each preserving the other from distortion.¹

To the best of my knowledge, prior to this statement no one ever claimed that the two perspectives on war and peace mutually support, correct, and complement each other. Usually authors juxtapose the two positions as divergent moral choices rooted in different, even irreconcilable, theological premises. As John Howard Yoder argued a year ago at a forum on the bishops' pastoral where we were co-panelists, "Someone can make a moral case for just war. Another person can attempt a moral case for pacifism. Both, however,

cannot possibly coexist in the same person. I do not see how they can really logically cohere (they can, of course, existentially coexist) in one church." In their striking moral claim the bishops seem, both to pacifists and just-war advocates, to ask us to square a circle never squared before!

To be sure, nowhere in their letter do the bishops adequately ground, either biblically or theologically, their contention of the mutual complementarity of the just-war and nonviolent traditions. That remains an unfinished theological agenda for our theologians and others to work on.²

It seems to me more likely that someone adhering to some version of the just-war tradition will find it easier to accommodate this claim of the complementarity of the two perspectives than someone who adheres to absolute pacifism. They might, for example, argue that nonviolent resistance represents a laudable eschatological witness, similar to celibacy or voluntary poverty, which does not bind either nation-states or ordinary moral consciences. This defense, however, would not do justice to the actual claims of most pacifists.

Similarly, some pacifists accept an earlier moral legitimacy of just-war principles for past limited wars. They argue, following James Douglas, that, while the just-war theory held moral sway in a previous era of war, it has died with the advent of "modern" wars (dated, variously, either from the period after World War II or, more stringently, from the period after the Napoleonic wars).³ The claim that the just-war tradition has died does justice neither to the claims of just-war advocates nor to the Church's continuing use of a just-war mode of arguing exemplified in the bishops' pastoral, paragraphs 80-199. On the face of it, it is no simple task to demonstrate the coherence between the two traditions which the bishops postulate.

1. Sentire cum Ecclesia

Ignatius proposed rules for "thinking" with the Church that have a much deeper meaning than this translation into "thinking" captures. Their details, of course, are dated. As John H. Wright, S.J., has observed, "Ignatius' rules were directly related to the conditions of the sixteenth century, and many of them do not touch our contemporary situation."⁴ The essential spirit behind these rules, however, should still animate the contemporary Jesuit. Among other things, they represent a basic strategy for living and working in loving loyalty to the Church. One of their main thrusts urges the exercitant to concentrate primarily on what will build up the Church, what

will promote Church unity and not division. More profoundly, they suggest a fundamental confidence in the decisions of the living tradition of the Church as embodying the trustworthy guarantee of Christ and his Spirit.

George Ganss, S.J., has given us the historical background for these rules. Ignatius lived in a new moment for the Church in the sixteenth century. He lived in a period of profound religious division. In his Rules for Thinking with the Church he steers a careful course around these divisions, between the heretics and *illuminati* on one hand and critical and disgruntled Catholics, inspired by Erasmus' *Colloquia*, on the other.⁵

In his article "On Being One with the Church Today," Ladislav Orsy, S.J., has attempted a contemporary restatement of the Ignatian Rules for Thinking with the Church, based on their original intent. As Orsy formulates a new set of nineteen rules for thinking with the Church today, his fifteenth reads: "To be one with the Church is to accept the mandate 'to bring the good news to the poor, to proclaim liberty to captives and to the blind new sight, to set the downtrodden free, to proclaim the Lord's year of favor.'" In Orsy's view, "To work for freedom, justice, and peace is an integral part of the task of the Church."⁶ It forms an integral part of the task of all Jesuits who always seek to understand their apostolic work as part of the larger Church.

I am appealing here to this aspect of the Ignatian spirit of thinking with the Church to propose that a spirituality for peacemakers is a possible arena for testing the complementarity between the just-war and the nonviolence traditions. I hope that this proposal might bring together the best efforts of those who adhere to one or the other of these traditions to work together for peace. It will be my contention, however, that while both just-war and nonviolence are legitimate forms of moral thinking, only the nonviolence tradition presently contains a spirituality for peacemaking.

2. Responses to the Bishops' Pastoral Exemplify the Need for *Sentire cum Ecclesia*

In their pastoral letter the American bishops declare that they discern a new moment in the Church and in our national history. Just as in the new moment of Ignatius' time, responses to the initiatives of the hierarchy have been varied. Some American Catholics object that the letter still contains an adherence, however carefully circumscribed, to a just-war mode of thinking.

They see the just-war doctrine as an obstacle to accepting the radical demands of the gospel. They fear that the bishops' moral acceptance of deterrence, however conditioned, can serve ideological purposes. They object to the continuing doubt which kept the bishops from unambiguously condemning all use of nuclear weapons. Others feel the bishops are in fact secret pacifists. They complain that in the bishops' hands just-war theory is not as realistic as it used to be.⁷ Some commentators, such as James Finn, object that the bishops have betrayed classic Catholic just-war theory by contaminating its moral logic with large doses of pacifist assumptions and premises.⁸

Faced with these divisions, Jesuits guided by the Rules for Thinking with the Church should look for strategies for living and working in loving loyalty to the Church by focusing primarily on what will build up the Church, what will promote Church unity and not division. Even if they do not yet see how to blend the two traditions of just-war and pacifism into one coherent theological theory, they should trust the collective discernment of the Church which proposes their complementarity.

No one has yet systematically reread the just-war principles in the consistent light and corrective of the nonviolence tradition to see how this rereading might preserve the just-war tradition from the ideological distortions to which it is prone. It is sobering to reflect that, with the exception of the American bishops late in the Vietnam War, no bishops' conference has ever used just-war criteria to adjudicate their nation's engagement in war and find it unjust. Notoriously, the pattern of the German and French bishops in World War I has been followed, as bishops support the justice of their own nation's cause. In addition, few know what it would really mean to preserve respect at least for the "moral traces" of the right to life, even when it is overridden in legitimate self-defense.⁹ Such a rereading of the just war through the lens of pacifism as a corrective should lead to some crucial reformulations of the just-war thinking about war and peace.

Those committed to nonviolence as an absolute typically endorse the judgment that "the only way to peace is peace." They might read the theological grounding for a just-war ethic to which the bishops appeal in paragraph 81 of the peace pastoral as an invitation to a greater emphasis on strategies of active resistance. In accord with the understanding of the bishops about the "not yet" dimension of the kingdom of God in history, the

nonviolent tradition will need to stress more the evils in not having a more effective instrumentality to resist injustice. Those who adhere to this tradition might imitate the example of Daniel Berrigan and other Jesuits who have engaged in nonviolent civil disobedience as a means of pursuing the fundamental goal of the just-war tradition: the vigorous re-establishment of justice which has been unjustly transgressed. Moreover, following the lead of the research of Gene Sharp, they will concern themselves, beyond the purity of witness, with devising effective nonviolent means to repel an unjust aggressor and to protect the lives and liberties of those innocently attacked.¹⁰

B. Morality and Spirituality

It is premature to attempt any definitive historical or theological grounding for the bishops' contention about a mutual complementarity of the just-war and nonviolence traditions. In the face of the many historical polemics by the adherents of the two traditions, any easy conflation or harmonization of the two must be suspect. I propose, more modestly, merely one aspect of possible complementarity between the two perspectives of just-war and nonviolence. Taking spirituality as a testing ground for it, I will contend that as a mode of moral reasoning, just-war thinking lacks a spirituality of peacemaking. We should seek elements for that spirituality in the non-violence tradition of spirituality.

The mode of moral reasoning which predominates in the just-war tradition basically roots its categories in an ethics of principles, rules, and norms. Its fundamental theological categories include charity and defense of justice for innocent victims of aggression. It appeals to the reality of sin which makes tragic choices between justice and nonviolence a genuine moral dilemma. However, the just-war tradition as such says little or nothing about the issue of virtue, character, the transformation of human persons into the embodiment of the peacemaker, anticipations of the kingdom in an ethics of discipleship. Yet these latter constitute crucial categories for any fully developed Christian ethics. The Christian moral life always includes more than mere norms. It looks to the transformation of the dispositions and character of persons. In addition, because only limited wars can ever be justified, as Michael Walzer has argued, the just-war theory remains basically conservative in its goals for changing the international order.¹¹ It lacks

resources to provide us with a vision of transformed social orders. Bluntly stated, there simply does not exist a spirituality of the just war. Just war remains an ethics without an appropriate spirituality.

I discovered the absence of such a spirituality for a just war through a deep personal challenge issued to me by my religious superior in Berkeley. It came just before I committed an act of civil disobedience protesting secret weapons research and support for arms buildup by Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, a so-called "campus" of the University of California system. He challenged me to go beyond any one gesture, however intuitively fitting it seemed, to probe the integrity of this action with a pervasive stance of spirituality and peacemaking. Wisely, he asked me to reflect on how this action cohered with the overall quality of my life.

When I turned to the ordinarily available resources for a spirituality of peacemaking, I discovered writings primarily by pacifists. Dorothy Day, William Stringfellow, James Douglas, Thomas Merton, Henri Nouwen, Ronald Sider, Jim Wallis, Daniel Berrigan, Dick McSorley--the names constitute a litany of pacifists. Similarly, in workshops on spirituality and peace or in the resources on this topic provided by Pax Christi and peace and justice networks, the pacifist voice once again prevailed.

On the other hand, just war has roots which reach back to Augustine and Aquinas, but as a mode of moral reasoning it became fully developed and detailed only after the sixteenth century, in the works of the great Spanish scholastics, Vitorio and Suarez. By that time, much of moral theology had been effectively split from ascetical and spiritual theology to become primarily a morality of principle, universal norm, and precedent. In our own time, both moralists--such as Stanley Hauerwas and Alisdair McIntyre, who plead for a morality of virtue and character--and spiritual writers have challenged this earlier split between moral theology and spirituality.

If I understand correctly the bishops' intuition about the complementarity of the two perspectives, I do not think it is possible to declare that the just-war doctrine is dead in Catholic moral thinking. The bishops in their pastoral still use it to propose moral judgments to the Catholic conscience. No one, to be sure, has to praise the doctrine (as in the suggestions about praising doctrines in the original Ignatian rules for *sentire cum ecclesia*). But a contemporary sense of *sentire cum ecclesia* will not allow a condemnation of the doctrine as morally bankrupt. It still forms an essential part

of the moral teaching and applications of the contemporary magisterium.

On the other hand, even a conscientious adherent of just-war theory feels compelled to agree with James Douglas' assessment in *The Non-Violent Cross* that the highest word of the just-war doctrine is not high enough for "an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude" as called for by Vatican II.¹² In paragraph 23 of their pastoral letter the American bishops agree. "Much of the history of Catholic theology on war and peace has focused on limiting the resort to force in human affairs; this task is still necessary, and is reflected later in this pastoral letter, but *it is not a sufficient response* to Vatican II's challenge to undertake a completely fresh appraisal of war."¹³

The deeper thrust of the pastoral calls us to conversion and an abiding commitment to stay with the issue of peace, in season and out, until we achieve a genuine about-face in the arms race. For that we will need to speak urgently and often of an ethics of discipleship, the type of Christian character formation needed to form peacemakers, suffering love, the cross--precisely the moral categories so strongly stressed in the tradition and spirituality of nonviolence. A Jesuit spirituality of peacemaking will naturally ground itself in the Ignatian *Exercises* with their emphasis in the Second Week on discipleship to Jesus and in the Third on the cross and with their stress on the *magis* and the third degree of humility. A certain elective affinity exists between these categories and the moral categories congenial to the nonviolent tradition. An Ignatian-based spirituality will move away from mere concern with limiting violence or an ethics of principles which neglects the issues of virtue and of human disposition, character, and discipleship and move toward the kind of spirituality which sustains a life of discipleship and suffering love.

Personally, I suspect that the consequence of taking this approach to bridging the ethics and the spirituality of peace will produce, in the end, more nonviolent resisters than just-war advocates. It seems to have done so historically, and it is certainly my own experience. But whether it entails this consequence or not, the Christian ethical life typical of the nonviolent tradition stresses a vocabulary of virtue, character, transforming love, the cross, a sustained vocation. This emphasis seems essential if we take seriously a spirituality of peacemaking for the long pull rather than concerning ourselves primarily with a moral calculus for decision making

in adjudicating issues of war and peace in a particular conflict.

Even those who retain a moral and theological respect for the importance of the just-war tradition should, it would seem, become just-war advocates with a difference! Especially in Section III of their pastoral on peace, the bishops envision an alternative to war and violence and the building of an order and community beyond war. The nonviolence tradition provides us with some vision for a way of acting and being to build and sustain a genuine spirituality of peacemaking. It contains a vocabulary of spirituality which touches the inner and personal transformation and quality of life. It may be possible, in principle, to forge a spirituality of peace consonant with just-war modes of thinking, but presently one looks in vain for books, articles, or workshops on a spirituality of peace with images and premises supportive of just-war categories. Hence, my proposal that the search for a spirituality of peacemaking might bring the two traditions into dialogue and form the complementary link supposed by the bishops' pastoral.

A year ago, a scientist from the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory turned to me at Bishop John Cummins' annual banquet for Catholic faculty at the University of California and the Graduate Theological Union. He knew that I had been arrested for civil disobedience in protest to the weapons research and weapons advocacy of Livermore Laboratory. "I have a case for my working at the lab and how it supports efforts for peace," he said. "I am also willing to state the conditions under which I would have to reconsider my job there and resign because it is immoral. I do not believe these conditions are yet fulfilled. I do not expect that you and I would ever fully agree. Perhaps what we can do, however, is share what it is about each other's position which gives each of us pause, asks us to reconsider or revise our case, forces us to further search."

The bishops' pastoral letter did not outright condemn all weapons research. "Thinking with the Church" seems to demand of me that I not simply reject that physicist's position. While I find it hard to imagine how I would ever agree with his conclusion, I think the process he suggests admirably embodies the kind of *sentire cum ecclesia* we need if we are to understand what the American bishops have said about the traditions of non-violence and just war.

I have already mentioned the greatest challenge to me from the just-war tradition: the need to devise effective means to repel an unjust aggressor

and to protect the lives and liberties of those innocently attacked. I judge that I can meet this challenge within the framework of the nonviolence tradition. I have suggested that pursuing a coherent spirituality to sustain an entirely new attitude toward war constitutes pacifism's greatest challenge to the just-war tradition, a spirituality that would mold the character of just-war advocates so they remain, in season and out, builders of peace and of an alternative world order which removes the threats to resort to war. The spirituality of peacemaking is a relatively neutral and untried testing ground on which just-war advocates and pacifists can probe and experience the claims about the complementarity of the two traditions suggested in the bishops' pastoral. Meanwhile, common adherence to the Ignatian spirit of *sentire cum ecclesia* invites adherents of both traditions to trust that both positions somehow belong to the riches of the Church and, thus, to find common cause and support in building, not "a certain kind of uncertain peace," but the kind of persons and kind of communal order not unworthy of the biblical word and prayer: *Shalom!*

IV. JESUIT PEACEMAKING IN THE AFTERMATH OF THREE GENERAL CONGREGATIONS

by

Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.
126 West 17th Street
New York, New York 10011

Authentic speech is a primary form of action. When U.S. Jesuits in 1985 ask, "What have we done for Christ the Prince of Peace?" our "mythic memory" needs to retrieve those peak moments of reflection when our Society was most seriously in search of its mission in our day. This essay, then, will consider those actions of the 31st, 32nd, and 33rd General Congregations (in 1965-1966, 1974-1975, and 1983) which have more immediate relevance to the special situation now created for Jesuits and others by the 1983 peace pastoral of the U.S. bishops.

A review of the three General Congregations convinces me that the Society of Jesus has yet to commit itself in depth to the struggle to end the arms race and bring our world to a condition of stable peace. The lack of such a commitment is understandable for reasons which I shall indicate. But, I feel, it is now incumbent on U.S. Jesuits to take initiatives to dispose our Society for such a commitment in the future.

This article focuses primarily on the 32nd General Congregation because I had more direct experience of it, but more importantly because I believe that it still contains more powerful energies for our ministry of peacemaking than the other two assemblies. We need, however, to keep present to the continuity which links the three gatherings. Each of them, with whatever limitations, constituted a Jesuit response to a contemporary global situation--of the sixties, seventies, and eighties--as well as a conscious effort to resonate with the responses being given within the larger Church. By and large, the official Jesuit voice regarding the arms race and peacemaking remains more of an echo than an original cry. I say this not in disparagement, but as a call to sound and imaginative initiatives.

A. The 32nd General Congregation

The significance of GC 32 for peacemaking finds expression in decree 4, which deals with our mission today as the service of faith and the promotion of justice. Three statements summarize this significance. With a slight

rhetorical flourish I would say that this pivotal document said (1) nothing; (2) something; (3) everything, about Jesuit peacemaking.

1. Nothing to Say

The word "peace" occurs just twice in decree 4. The document quotes the familiar exercise of Ignatius on the Incarnation, "some at peace, and some at war" (no. 14; see *Spiritual Exercises*, [106]). Later we come across a casual coupling of three Christian values: ". . . people are groping towards an experience of Christ and waiting in hope for His Kingdom of love, of justice and of peace" (no. 21).¹

And so GC 32 had not a word to say about the arms race or about the issue of global peace described by the recent pastoral of the U.S. bishops. We need to ask, "Why this total silence on a global issue of such immeasurable magnitude, on which the universal Church had spoken many times?"

I can think of two complementary explanations. First, the delegates had no desire to enter into the analysis and evaluation of specific social issues. They wished only to restate the Society's abiding mission in generic language appropriate for today. This explanation is plausible but not adequate. Our mission could just as readily have been identified by combining the notions of peace and justice, as the Church had done countless times, as by choosing to speak of faith and justice. Why did this not happen?

The chief reason, I believe, lies in the historical context of decree 4. The primary energies which generated this major statement, both through postulates and through the delegates, came from Latin America, with support from other Assistancies, particularly from North America and Great Britain. These energies found embodiment not in the language of peace but in the language of justice and the option for the poor. They targeted not the global threat to human survival constituted by the arms race, but social, political, and economic oppression, particularly as experienced in the Third World. Latin American Jesuits, deeply engaged in the sociopolitical struggle articulated by liberation theology, chose as their primary symbolic term justice, uncoupled with peace. This choice found support among delegates of the Anglo-Saxon world. "Horizon" and "priority of priorities" expressed in the opening days of GC 32 the desire that justice be considered as not merely one issue among many but the basic standpoint from which the Congregation ought to view its entire task. From this standpoint, not the

arms race but the oppression of the poor provided the catalyst for the envisaged restatement of our Jesuit mission.²

Even prior to GC 32, the theme of justice had encountered a few others, particularly the theme of faith and evangelization, the theme chosen for the third synod of bishops, which had concluded several weeks before GC 32 began. Concern for the unfulfilled mandate to combat atheism given to GC 31 by Paul VI also contributed to the interaction of ideas. From this meeting of the waters emerged a formulation of our mission today which placed faith and justice--more fully, the service of faith and the promotion of justice--as the poles of the tension which brought such fresh energies to the life of the Society during the past decade.

Though this specific formulation was new, its substance was not. For about a decade the Church had been speaking the language of evangelization and development, evangelization and liberation. When the different tendencies present within GC 32 tugged at the language of decree 4 to accent either faith or justice, they reenacted on a smaller scale the struggle of different theologies in the larger Church to find the most appropriate formulation of the relationship between the Christian and secular dimensions of human history.

If, then, GC 32 had nothing directly to say about Jesuit peacemaking, I would explain the silence partly in terms of the deliberate avoidance of specific issues, and partly by the historical fact that the energies which shaped the language of decree 4 came from a different preoccupation. This first finding--that GC 32 had nothing to say about peacemaking--is not otiose. If the global Society of Jesus does become passionate for peacemaking to the degree to which it has become passionate for faith and justice, it will be of considerable interest to know that, in 1974-1975, the energies for reformulating our mission were not drawn from the peace movement as it then existed in the U.S. Church.

2. Something to Say

Decree 4 had *something* to say about Jesuit peacemaking in the limited sense that it addressed itself to one of the major global challenges to effective peacemaking, namely, the complex network of unjust social structures and institutions which block the peace of the world. When one looks in GC 32, beyond its pairing of faith and justice, for a new language about the object of our mission, one finds it primarily in the recurring mention

of the structures of society and the influence which they have on human life and on the work of evangelization.

There is a new challenge to our apostolic mission in a world increasingly interdependent but, for all that, divided by injustice; injustice not only personalized but institutionalized; built into economic, social, and political structures that dominate the life of nations and the international community (no. 6).

It is becoming more and more evident that the structures of society are among the principal formative influences in our world, shaping people's ideas and feelings, shaping their most intimate desires and aspirations; in a word, shaping mankind itself. The struggle to transform these structures in the interest of the spiritual and material liberation of fellow human beings is intimately connected to the work of evangelization (no. 40).

In the immediate aftermath of Vatican II, GC 31 had begun to tap into a new Christian awareness of how structures and institutions can participate in the sin of the world as well as in the grace of redemption. In decree 4 of GC 32 this consciousness became a major Jesuit realization and a key factor affecting our apostolic goals and strategies. For reasons already given, decree 4 did not choose to analyze how the structures of injustice are the same structures which impede the peace of the world. Still, its insistence that the mission of faith and justice is directed not only to the conversion of persons but to the transformation of structures said *something*, and constitutes within decree 4 a significant point of attachment to the more recently felt call to be Jesuit peacemakers. When this call eventually does find a major response from our Society as a whole, I have little doubt that analysis of structures which violate both justice and the peace of the world will be integral to such a statement. The response will also echo what the rest of the Church, from official pronouncements to grassroots projects, has been saying: Peace is the work of justice. Both conversion of hearts and transformation of structures have a common goal, justice and peace, peace and justice.³

3. Everything to Say

Decree 4 really did, in a sense, have *everything* to say about Jesuit peacemaking. In speaking extensively about the service of faith and the promotion of justice, its most central and challenging word had to do with *method*, indeed with a specific method. The principal lesson we can learn

from decree 4 about peacemaking is how to go about it.

From Ignatius to Bernard Lonergan, method has been a Jesuit preoccupation and a Jesuit gift. Almost the very first sentence of the *Spiritual Exercises* defines them as "every method [Puhl's translation of *todo modo*] of examination of conscience" and so forth (*SpEx*, [1]). The text of the *Exercises*, for the most part rather dull and prosaic, finds its primary power not in the inspiration contained in particular exercises, and not even in the occasional bursts of lyric or romantic ardor, but rather in the plodding insistence on method, on a flexible set of directives, some basic and some merely illustrative, which dispose the director and retreatant for the action of God.

Method also constitutes the heart of decree 4. So, at least, thought one eminently qualified to judge, Pedro Arrupe. His conference "The Practical Dispositions of Decree 4 of the 32nd General Congregation" remains the best commentary on that document.⁴ "It has been said in another context that the medium is the message," writes Father Arrupe, alluding of course to Marshall McLuhan's celebrated dictum. "Here we may say that 'the method is the message'." He then goes on to develop an interpretation of the key paragraphs of decree 4 (nos. 70-77) which deals with reflection, discernment, conscientization, insertion, and the like. He concludes his discussion by saying: "The method this Decree proposes for our application of that mission to the world of today can serve as a criterion for applying all the other decrees too. In other words, *Decree 4 is the key for applying the Congregation itself*" (italics added).

This conference of Father Arrupe deserves to be studied carefully by Jesuit novices and by all Jesuits. I will not stop here to analyze in detail the method of conscientization and apostolic discernment mandated by decree 4. But several historical observations may be helpful as we try to make this "everything" of GC 32 effective for Jesuit peacemaking.

First, as in the case of its language of faith and justice, GC 32 did not break trail for the rest of the Church in calling for method in our addressing of global issues. Rather it was echoing and amplifying a call already given by Paul VI (*Octogesima Adveniens*, no. 4) when it declared:

The general method to be followed to produce this awareness and engage in this discernment may be described as a constant interplay between experience, reflection, decision, and action, in line with the Jesuit ideal of being 'contemplative in action' (no. 73).⁵

Second, the principal effort in the United States to flesh out the method described by decree 4, following *Octogesima Adveniens*, stems from an initiative of the Center of Concern. Its staff elaborated a process model for *Convergence*, a joint assembly of the *Conference of Major Superiors of Men* and the *Leadership Conference of Women Religious* held in Cleveland in 1978. A thousand participants engaged in a four-day exercise in "the pastoral circle" comprising the four elements of experience (or insertion), social analysis, theological reflection, and pastoral planning.⁶

Third, on an Assistancy level, the U.S. Jesuit Provincials initiated in 1979 a process which would implement the call of decree 4 for a method of apostolic reflection and discernment. The principal fruit of this project thus far consists of a set of essays, *The Context of Our Ministries: Working Papers*, which attempted to apply the directive of decree 4 to the U.S. scene. Two of these papers discussed the question of method in theoretical and practical fashion. Originally the provincials had envisaged that the total process would lead to the actual choice by U.S. Jesuits of preferred forms of ministry or emphases in ministry. In the fall of 1982, the provincials chose the issue of peace and war in a nuclear age, or the arms race, as the specific issue to be pursued.

This, then, represents how far we have come at the official level: The Jesuit Conference Board, the provincials, have called U.S. Jesuits to apply the method prescribed in decree 4 specifically to the arms race and peacemaking. To describe similar events at the grassroots would take this essay beyond its limited intent. I will only share a strong impression, namely, that effort at the local level to develop the method envisaged by decree 4 has been for the most part minimal and inefficacious. By and large, Jesuits at the grassroots, within their communities and in their ministries, remain strangers to serious methodical communal reflection and discernment as proposed by GC 32. *The Context of Our Ministries*, intended as a tool for such a process, seems to have received considerably more attention outside the Society than within it (at last check the Center of Concern had sold about 4000 copies to its largely non-Jesuit clientele). I mention this apparent failure of U.S. Jesuits to carry out the key directive of decree 4 not in order to denigrate anyone or to spawn pessimism but rather to stimulate a fresh pondering of the difficulty of making good on our commitment. It is one thing to lunge generously at this call of our

times. It is another thing, and a distinctively Ignatian response, to persevere in seeking the best method for utilizing our personal, communal, and institutional resources.

B. The 31st General Congregation

If GC 32 provides the pivotal event of Jesuit renewal of the past few decades, our understanding of it finds enlargement when we situate it between GC 31 and GC 33 from the standpoint of Jesuit peacemaking. An appreciation of what GC 31 said--and did not say--on our theme calls first for some comment on its own historical context. The first session of this Congregation extended from May to July of 1965; the second session went from September to November of 1966. In the period between the two sessions, Vatican II's fourth and final session opened in September 1965 and closed in December of the same year. During the three years of the Council's meeting, several major statements on the arms race and on peacemaking had been made by the Council itself and by Popes John XXIII and Paul VI. John XXIII's encyclical *Peace on Earth* in April 1963, the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, promulgated in the last days of the Council in December 1965, and Paul VI's impassioned plea to the United Nations in October 1965 represent the three most important of these utterances. The delegates of GC 31 were surely not without rich stimulus and source material for anything they might choose to say about peace.

. Another element of context is important for situating GC 31 from the standpoint of peacemaking. Although it was convoked as a chapter of election consequent upon the death of Father General Janssens in 1964, it served, particularly in its second session, as the extraordinary general chapter which each religious community was directed to hold in order to implement Vatican II's decree on religious life. No fewer than forty-eight decrees, many of them quite brief, constituted the response of the Society of Jesus to this mandate and, more broadly, to the call of Vatican II for the renewal of the whole Church.

So far as peacemaking is concerned, GC 31 only faintly echoed what the Council and its two pontiffs had said with such passion. The arms race, of such grave concern to the larger Church, evoked a virtual silence from this major Jesuit meeting. In the voluminous documents we find only two passing references to peacemaking. The decree on ecumenism mentions those Jesuits

"who . . . collaborate in international organizations for peace and unity" (no. 12). And the decree on the social apostolate--which fell far short of GC 32's subsequent conception of the ministry of faith and justice as the horizon of all Jesuit ministry--uses the tetradic language of *Peace on Earth*: ". . . the companions of Jesus . . . are trying to restore 'peace on earth,' a peace that is 'based on truth, on justice, on love, on freedom'" (no. 3). Clearly, then, the impassioned plea of Vatican II and its two popes evoked no similar passion from this Jesuit body. As in the case of GC 32, we may here again ask: Why?

I base my response to this question on two contextual factors. First, the massive output of Vatican II, still incomplete during the first session of GC 31, provided the Society of Jesus, and all religious orders and congregations, with an overwhelming agenda for reflection and for incorporation into their lives and ministries. However urgent the issue of the arms race and peacemaking, it tended to get lost amid a multiplicity of other issues and insights clamoring for attention. Discussion of the subject of prayer, for example, occupied an extraordinary amount of time in GC 31. In retrospect, GC 31 appears as a kind of forensic smorgasbord, with decrees ranging from spiritual exhortation and the theological assimilation of Vatican II insights to pragmatic adjustments of our laws and structures to the directives of the Council regarding religious life. GC 31 was called originally to elect a new general in 1965; it was only the second session in 1966 that enabled it to qualify as the extraordinary general chapter mandated in the aftermath of Vatican II. At such short notice, it is not surprising that the delegates did not succeed in resonating fully even with the major social utterances of the universal Church assembled in council.

But proximity to Vatican II does not completely explain the virtual silence of GC 31 on the arms race and peacemaking. A second contextual surmise is that the delegates brought to GC 31 on the issue of peacemaking nothing like the passion which later was brought to GC 32 on the issue of justice. This, I would guess, was particularly true of the delegates from the American Assistancy, who, as today, might be expected to be the primary bearers within the global Society of Jesus of a sense of urgency regarding the arms race. Though I am no historian, I believe that a study of the peace movement in the Church and in the Society of Jesus in the United States would reveal that by 1966 it had not yet come to a point of deep

consciousness and passionate commitment on the part of more than a handful of pioneers.

For both of these reasons, then, it seems in retrospect almost inevitable that GC 31, despite its general concern for "thinking with the Church," experienced no special call to walk with the larger Church by making a serious commitment of the Society of Jesus to the ministry of peacemaking.

C. The 33rd General Congregation

As in the case of GC 31, I write of GC 33 from the limited perspective of one who was not a delegate, who has not conversed extensively with those who were, and who has not had access to the postulates and other documents besides the published decrees. I did have the benefit of discussion in my own local community and in our New York provincial congregation prior to GC 33.

It seems fair to say that the delegates to this latest General Congregation could, in pride and peace, say after their relatively brief labors, "We did what we needed to do." GC 33 met, of course, in order to elect a new general. Abstractly, it was free to do much more, over one or more sessions, extending if necessary for several months. But for various reasons good sense counseled a modest and pragmatic effort. We have good reason for satisfaction with the results.

The primary contribution of GC 33, apart from its choice of new leadership, consisted in its basic and explicit fidelity to the course set in GC 31 and GC 32, whose directives had been pursued with such scrupulous fidelity by our official leadership under Pedro Arrupe. On the specific theme of peacemaking, GC 33 made a significant contribution within the severe limits imposed by its historical context. It remains true, however, that in this assembly the Society of Jesus did not make a major commitment of itself to peacemaking with a seriousness and depth comparable to GC 32's commitment to faith and justice. In a universal Society where the passion for peacemaking is not yet intense, and where many facets of this ministry of peace need further debate, especially across Assistancy lines, no merely verbal statement of commitment, such as in fact GC 33 made, could constitute such a major commitment. This assembly of 1983 did bring our Society a few steps closer to a possible commitment. Once again the historical context enlightens what we said and what we did not yet say.

In the American Assistancy prior to GC 33, an attraction to peacemaking, especially in the context of the arms race, had been growing. Several Provincial Congregations and other individuals and groups sought action from GC 33 on behalf of peace. Most U.S. Jesuits realized, however, that a brief General Congregation meeting after minimal preparation could come to no serious consensus. It was possible to hope, however, that GC 33 would get some wheels turning on the issue, for example, by directing the new Father General to provide for the kind of study and dialogue which would eventually produce a major statement from the Society. That the Congregation made no such specific provision is, in retrospect, fortunate. Committees and commissions often function as convenient disposal bins for difficult topics. As I will say shortly, I believe that the present moment calls for us to work from the grassroots, not from above, towards an eventual commitment of the Society of Jesus to the cause of global peace.

GC 33 went beyond its two predecessors on the subject of peacemaking, but in quite modest fashion. It also left unresolved some real tensions existing between different sectors of the worldwide Society of Jesus regarding the place of the arms race in our broad strategy of faith and justice. Here is how I would summarize the situation as it stands in 1985.

First, GC 33 effectively broke the virtual silence of our global Society regarding the arms race and peacemaking. The second part of decree 1, in listing some major forces hostile to the spreading of the Kingdom, speaks of a "frightening arms race and the nuclear threat" (no. 35). Among signs of hope it mentions the Church as "more and more engaged in works of peace and justice" (no. 36). The response to John Paul II's homily to the delegates alludes to his call to promote "the justice, connected with world peace, which is an aspiration of all peoples" (no. 37). A little later there is another cursory use of the phrase "justice, love, and peace" (no. 42). These passages indicate that the delegates carried prominently in their consciousness the theme of peacemaking.

Second, as Peter Henriot has reported, a major block to a more unqualified commitment to the work of peace consists in the inability of GC 33, given its time constraints, to resolve the serious concerns of Jesuits in Eastern Europe and Latin America.⁷ The former tend to hear the language of peace against the background of the Communist peacemaking rhetoric. For the latter, focusing on the arms race is often perceived as a

distraction from the primary issues of poverty, dependency, and violations of justice.

Third, despite the reservations just noted, GC 33 did make one impressive statement of commitment which includes the work of peacemaking in its scope. After mentioning some special problems frequently contained in the postulates, for example, human rights, refugees, exploitation of women, the delegates declared:

As an international body, the Society of Jesus commits itself to that work which is the promotion of a more just world order, greater solidarity of rich countries with poor, and a lasting peace based on human rights and freedom. At this critical moment for the future of humanity, many Jesuits are cooperating more directly in the work for peace as intellectuals, organizers and spiritual leaders, and by their witness of non-violence. Following the example of recent Popes, we must strive for international justice and an end to the arms race that deprives the poor and threatens to destroy civilization. The evangelical call to be genuine peacemakers cautions us to avoid both naivete and fatalism (no. 46).

However impressive in the seriousness of its language, the statement leaves us, I believe, in the novitiate of peacemaking, prior even to first vows. True, our silence has been broken, and the statement constitutes an important reference point for our commitment to the ministry of peacemaking. Still, in my opinion, that commitment remains a future expectation. How can we dispose ourselves for it? Let me offer five suggestions.

First, we should withstand any tendency to deal with our call as Jesuit peacemakers by asking our official leadership, at Assistancy or international levels, to make further statements, set up commissions, and the like. GC 33 said as much as it could. Our U.S. Provincials have already called us to make the arms race a ministerial priority.

Second, the primary source of energy for peacemaking initiatives among Jesuits and their associates will consist in small groups meeting and reflecting and acting over a period of years. Several interesting efforts have already been made, for example, the two-day symposium at Bellarmine Preparatory School in San Jose, California, in 1984, nationally aired on CBS; and the two-day vigil at the Pentagon in May of 1984 undertaken by a group of New York and Maryland Jesuits, with the participation of Jesuit Volunteer Corps members and others. Experience with a small Jesuit group in New York City over a period of two or three years has made me appreciate both the value and the difficulties of this kind of bonding.

Third, as such groups are developed throughout the country, it is important that they find ways to communicate with one another. Eventually they may serve as a needed leaven in the mass, affecting and being affected by the day-to-day ministry and community life of Jesuits and their associates

Fourth, we belong to a global Society with an immense potential for peacemaking. Linkages with Jesuits in other countries can be a powerful source of energy. But here again I would not look for a comprehensive official structure, but for a relatively small beginning. The natural place to begin is with Jesuits of North and Central America. Thanks to the initiatives in 1983 of Central American Jesuits asking for our assistance in their efforts to promote justice for their people, and thanks to both unofficial and official responses to this request, a general link has already been forged. This contact might be enlarged into a dialogue whose content would include not merely the struggle for justice in Central America, but also serious attention to the linkage between that struggle and the arms trade. The emergence of a significant current of sympathy for the practice of nonviolence among North American Jesuits offers another area of possible dialogue with our Jesuit brothers in Central America, many of whom support the position, more traditional among Catholics, of revolutionary force used as a last resort against oppression. Precisely because of our differences, not in spite of them, such an intercultural dialogue with our Central American brothers could enrich the whole Church as its consciousness, doctrine, and moral norms regarding war and peace continue to develop.

Fifth (and finally), a truly Jesuit and truly Ignatian initiative of this kind requires a conscious intent to develop appropriate *methods* of dialogue and action, based on Ignatian discernment and on the hints regarding method given by GC 32 and GC 33.

What is needed, eventually, is a communal Jesuit *Suscipe* which, in the naming of our mission today, adds to the faith/justice language of GC 32 a deep commitment of the Society of Jesus to the ministry of peacemaking in our global society.

V. CALLED TO BE PEACEMAKERS: LIVING WITH TENSIONS IN THE ACTIVE MINISTRY

by

Peter J. Henriot, S.J.
Center of Concern
3700 13th Street N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20017

"The evangelical call to be genuine peacemakers cautions us to avoid both naivete and fatalism." This final sentence in paragraph 47 of Companions of Jesus Sent into Today's World, the document of the 33rd General Congregation, contains a double warning. We Jesuits must not be naive in our struggle for a peace based on human rights and freedom; in other words, we should be wary of easy answers to complex questions and we should avoid offering moralisms instead of social analysis. But we must also not be fatalistic, overwhelmed by the immense and intricate character of the war-and-peace issue and thus unable or unwilling to commit ourselves to work for change. In the debate over paragraph 47, the insistence of some Congregation delegates on cautioning against simple approaches was matched strongly by other delegates' insistence that we do indeed act forthrightly against the impending catastrophe threatened especially by the policies of the two nuclear superpowers.

This call to be peacemakers was made by the Congregation only after considerable refinement of what the task actually demanded. Not all delegates viewed the task in the same way, and the debate revealed serious questioning of the inclusion of peacemaking in the mission of the service of faith and the promotion of justice.

The topic came onto the agenda of GC 33 because provincial congregations from around the world had submitted a series of postulates requesting that the work of peace be central to all our apostolates. Spurred by the leadership of the U.S. Catholic bishops' peace pastoral, many Jesuits of the American Assistancy emphasized a need to commit the Society to an active ministry of peace through involvement in education, lobbying, organizing, and witnessing in the movement to turn around the arms race and the nuclear policies of the superpowers. This received encouragement in the homily of Pope John Paul II at the opening of the Congregation when he explicitly linked peace to the work for justice.

Initially, however, this "option for peace" was resisted by two very

different groups of delegates when it was presented in the first draft of the Commission on "Mission." On the one hand, some Jesuits from Eastern Europe objected that the focus on "peace" today is a Communist theme. It is used by their repressive governments in order to stifle dissent, promote conformity, justify military rule of subject peoples, and mask a buildup of massive armaments. To say that Jesuits are committed to peace seemed to them to be dangerously ambiguous.

On the other hand, some Jesuits from Latin America felt that the interest in the nuclear arms question was a "luxury" of the rich countries. It was seen by them as a distraction from the deeper and more immediately pressing problems of poverty and oppression in the Third World. Commitment to peace would be meaningless, these delegates argued, if it ignored these serious problems.

Grappling with these questions provided a worthwhile clarification for the Congregation of the content and context of peace and its relationship to faith and justice. The Eastern Europeans were satisfied when subsequent drafts of the text read that what we are called to work for is "peace based on human rights and freedom." This said much more than what their Communist governments stood for. And the Latins found acceptable the commitment to peace when it was placed with the "promotion of a more just world order [and] greater solidarity of rich countries with poor." Recognition of global economic dimensions of peaceful relations between nations gave prominence to the priorities of the Third World.

Were these clarifications only empty verbal distinctions? I do not believe so. The clarifications simply reemphasized the importance of locating the struggle for peace always within the search for justice. As the popes have often stated, peace is not simply the absence of conflict but the presence of the conditions of peace, the structures of justice. It is a particular kind of peace--bound to freedom and justice--which the Society must promote through education and action.

That promotion, however, is not without its tensions. There are obvious tensions within the wider public sphere, as Jesuit active ministry for peace is understood or not, appreciated or not, accepted or not, by those with whom we work and whom we serve. But there are also important tensions within the lives of individual Jesuits and our communities as we seek to discern the most appropriate response to the call to be peacemakers. These

tensions are not simply between the good and the bad, but between different styles, different emphases,

I believe that the double warning expressed in the document of GC 33--to avoid both naivete and fatalism--can be read as a call for *spiritual freedom* in facing these tensions. To act effectively and in a truly evangelical fashion in the struggle for peace today requires a degree of freedom appropriate to one who is a child of God, a companion of Jesus, and filled with the Spirit. This spiritual freedom is manifested in style as well as in substance. The Jesuit called to be a peacemaker must be free enough to respond to the demands for boldness in the face of complacency and nonconcern, for courage in the face of risks and uncertainties, for perseverance in the face of obstacles and defeats. But he must also be free enough to acknowledge ambiguities, shortcomings, mistakes, and failures in himself, in the causes he expounds, in the movements he supports. Without such spiritual freedom, he can be either paralyzed or blind. Neither condition promotes a genuinely evangelical stance in the work of peacemaking.

It seems to me that as we Jesuits engage in the struggle to promote peace in today's world, a frank recognition of some of the personal tensions we experience is crucial if our struggle is to be marked by spiritual freedom. Let me suggest that this is true at three important moments in the struggle. First, we must recognize the tensions faced in what is *motivating* us, what prompts us to be involved in action for peace. Second, we must understand the tensions in what is *guiding* us in the midst of action, what leads us in our involvement. And third, we must acknowledge the tensions experienced in *evaluating* our action when it is completed, judging whether or not it was worthwhile.

But before setting forth a series of six of these tensions, I want to make a few rather obvious but necessary observations. First, there are many more than these six tensions operative in social situations relating to action on behalf of peace. I choose these six simply as examples which are fundamental and which I personally have experienced and know that other Jesuits have experienced. Second, the tensions discussed here all occur also in social-action situations other than peace activity, but I concentrate mainly on their peacemaking manifestations for purposes of our explanation here. Third, these tensions are present throughout the stages of motivation, guidance, and evaluation, but I place them in one category or another for

the purpose of emphasizing their particular influence.

A. Motivation

1. Guilt or Responsibility

What motivates us to get involved in active peace ministry? For most of us Jesuits, our motivations are mixed. But I believe that many of us at times experience a tension between being prompted by guilt and being moved by responsibility.

To be prompted by guilt to engage in action for peace is, I believe, not helpful in the long run. Guilt is not empowering, since we only feel moved to action as long as we feel guilty. We may commit ourselves to some political action for peace, for instance, or engage in some witness such as participating in a demonstration or in an act of civil disobedience, because if we don't do so we will feel bad. Others seem so much more involved, so much more committed, than we are that we experience a feeling of guilt for not being more active. But the problem is that there is no "staying power" in being motivated by guilt. It is not truly an experience of freedom.

On the other hand, to be moved by responsibility is to experience power and freedom. That is, the sense that we are responsible persons, able to effect change, is a sense of strength which endures. Faced with obstacles or setbacks, we can continue to struggle for peace--especially with the specifics of peace, such as concrete legislation for disarmament--with a resoluteness born of a feeling of mature responsibility. For example, in the current efforts to turn around the U.S. government's military policies, we Jesuits need to recognize our roles as educators and pastors, and act with the responsibility expected of us. History offers harsh judgments on silence in the face of gross injustices.

2. Anger or Love

In identifying a tension between the motivations of anger and love as a basis for peace action, I must be careful to distinguish the anger which I am referring to here from what is called a righteous anger. It is certainly right and proper to feel great anger over the mindless pursuit of the arms race and its disastrous consequences for the poor. Just as Jesus felt anger

at the violation of the sacredness of the Temple, so should we feel anger at policies that threaten the future of the human family. But what causes serious tension is, I believe, to be moved by an aggressive feeling--even a hatred--toward political or military leaders, or others whom we identify as "enemies." This is a feeling which dehumanizes them in our sight. Such anger may, in reality, be primarily a rejection of authority, a reaction against past experiences of injustice, real or imaginary. The feeling is debilitating because it is blinding; it distracts us from the real issues. We sometimes say, for instance, that a certain person is "so angry that he can't see straight!" This certainly has consequences for the clear judgments necessary for effective action for peace.

Love as a motivation, however, clarifies and focuses our efforts for peace. Love prompts us to engage in action on behalf of peace because of what peace means for persons, for our sisters and brothers. It turns us away from ideologies and abstractions and toward the concreteness of real people. An example of this comes to mind when I consider the new Vietnam War Memorial in Washington, D.C. This memorial probably does more to foster commitment to peace than any other Washington site--simply because its long list of the names of the more than 50,000 U.S. soldiers killed in that war touches us more immediately than heroic statuary or romantic poetry. The motivation of love engenders enthusiasm and sustains dedication. Love of peace rather than anger at war empowers us to go out of ourselves in true self-sacrifice.

B. Guidance

3. Fear or Risk

In the midst of action for peace, we often can experience the tension between debilitating fears and freeing risks. Fear of making a mistake, fear of being rejected, fear of losing influence, fear of appearing foolish: Jesuits are not the only ones who face these fears, but they can have special meanings for each of us. The experience of fear obviously restricts our involvement, restrains our enthusiasm. But freedom comes when we experience risk, or the readiness to take a chance, to step out into the unknown, even to make a mistake.

This in no way implies that we do not intelligently examine the positions we support and realistically weigh the consequences of actions we take. But

we do this as Christians who cannot expect to escape misunderstanding or ridicule in following the Lord. Furthermore, both the *Spiritual Exercises* and the *Constitutions* remind us Jesuits that a choice to be with Jesus can be a risky choice, one which brings suffering and opprobrium. In their pastoral letter, the U.S. Bishops stated that disarmament begins with "disarming the heart." We must be willing to leave ourselves defenseless, vulnerable. Then, paradoxically, we are truly in a position of strength in responding to the challenge of peacemaking.

4. Respectability or Authenticity

In making choices as Jesuits about what actions we might take for peace, a frequent tension experienced arises from our concern about how we are viewed by others. And so we have to examine ourselves: Is what we are doing to promote peace guided by what is considered "respectable"? That is, is it acceptable, approved, nonthreatening to the wider society and/or our Society? Or are we guided by what is "authentic," by what is true and consistent? Are we making choices on the basis of a consistency with the ideals which we profess?

The tension experienced here is very real for us Jesuits who value professionalism and a good reputation. Yet we can acknowledge that the desire for respectability can weaken our commitment because it turns our focus from the essential matter at hand toward more peripheral matters such as human respect. It can cause real discouragement because it frustrates our idealism. Several months ago, I was standing with a group of Jesuits from the New York and Washington area in a prayerful vigil in front of the Pentagon. At times I nervously wondered what some friends of mine--some of whom worked for the government, even for the Pentagon--would think of me if they knew I engaged in such "unprofessional" activities. I experienced a restriction of freedom, not because of the issue at hand but because of a desire not to appear too "radical." A quest for authenticity, however, can provide better guidance because it gives us clarity of vision in pursuit of our goals. If we sense that what we are about in promoting peace "rings true," then we have the freedom to continue even in the face of serious difficulties. This is true, of course, in a classroom situation as well as in a political demonstration. We experience a fidelity to our ideals which gives us strength.

5. Paralysis or Engagement

The feeling that issues of war and peace are complex matters can be helpful in preventing us from stumbling blindly into some political position, making judgments that are simply ill-informed. But the feeling of complexity can also be a trap. Inducing in us a form of paralysis, it can weaken our efforts by unduly shaking us in our purpose. This is especially true for us Jesuits, who tend to want to study a topic more before taking a stand, before becoming engaged. For example, overwhelmed by all the intricate moral debates over deterrence or all the contradictory data comparing superpower capabilities, we may become paralyzed, unable to judge or act. On the other hand, active engagement can frequently clarify our direction. It can give us a fresh experience of the simplicity of the matter, in the sense that we can indeed grasp the few most important moral principles and empirical descriptions of the war-peace situation today. This gives us new energy to take a risk and act. Engagement prods us to focus on the most fundamental issues and to respond with clarity and confidence to these, while simultaneously helping us to reexamine our positions and critically evaluate our actions. This development was clarified for me when I heard a recent speaker in a peace demonstration in Washington remind us: "Instead of waiting to think ourselves into new ways of acting, we need to act ourselves into new ways of thinking."

Living with the tension between paralysis and engagement is not easy, however, especially when we are in fact aware of the intricacies of the debates. But I believe that the U.S. bishops were challenging us to take the necessary first steps when they concluded their discussion of the ethics of the deterrence policy by stating: "Reflecting the complexity of the nuclear problem, our arguments in this pastoral must be detailed and nuanced; but our no to nuclear war must in the end be definitive and decisive" (no. 138). The *no--or yes--of* engagement must not be delayed by a paralysis induced by the complexities of the situation. Another way of saying this, of course, is to emphasize the traditional virtue of prudence. Prudential decisions have to be made with the limited information at hand; prudential action gathers more information in the very process of engagement.

C. Evaluation

6. Success or Hope

Because of the influence of the U.S. ethos of the "bottom line," we Jesuits can readily feel a tension in reflecting on how much we really have achieved by our active peace ministry. We can tend to evaluate our work solely in terms of our "successes." Yet we know that success is elusive at best, illusory at worst. This is especially true in the struggle for peace, which must be long and sustained despite frequent setbacks. The peace movement during the Vietnam War offered a good example of this; the current struggle to limit production of the MX missile is another example. If we evaluate our efforts according to the number of "successes" we have achieved, we will surely feel the debilitating effect of discouragement.

Hope, however, is neither elusive nor illusory for the Christian. It is the empowering experience of the rightness of the cause, of the goodness of at least being engaged in the struggle. "Blessed are the peacemakers" is reason enough for our hope, no matter what the outcome of our efforts may be according to the worldly standards of success. It is not as if we eschew any success--for we do have to be accountable for our actions. But we weight the worth of our active ministry for peace by criteria which do not simply focus on the "bottom line."

D. Conclusion

Avoidance of "naivete" and "fatalism" in our Jesuit pursuit of peace appears to me to demand living with a series of tensions about our motivations, our guidance, our evaluation. The spiritual freedom called for is not without price, not experienced in perfect tranquillity. My own personal experience, and the personal experience which Jesuits and others have shared with me, lead me to conclude that these tensions can indeed be creative. But they have to be lived with.

The call to peacemaking, the U.S. Bishops reminded us, is primarily a religious call. The response we make may take a variety of forms, as indicated in paragraph 47 of the document of GC 33. Peace education in our high schools and colleges, research and writing, homilies in our parishes and retreat houses, counseling situations, participation in demonstrations and civil disobedience, commitment to nonviolence, involvement in political

campaigns; these and many other activities will keep us engaged in an active ministry for peace. Living with the tensions will facilitate a freedom to be engaged despite obstacles and will open for us paths truly consonant with our Jesuit vocation.

ENDNOTES

For III, by John A. Coleman, S.J.

- 1 "The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response," in Philip J. Murnion, ed., *Catholics and Nuclear War* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), p. 285.
- 2 For one attempt to give some theological grounding to the bishops' assertion about the complementarity of the two perspectives, see David Hollenbach, S.J., *Nuclear Ethics: A Christian Moral Argument* (New York: Paulist, 1983), pp. 5-35.
- 3 James Douglas, *The Non-Violent Cross* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968).
- 4 See John H. Wright, S.J., "The Church Changing Today as in the Past," in John Wright, George Ganss, Ladislav Orsy, "On Thinking with the Church Today," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, VII, 1 (January, 1975).
- 5 George Ganss, S.J., "St. Ignatius' Rules for Thinking with the Church," *ibid.*, p. 13.
- 6 Ladislav Orsy, S.J., "On Being One with the Church Today," *ibid.*, p. 38.
- 7 See Michael Novak, "Moral Clarity in the Nuclear Age," in *National Review*, April 1, 1983, pp. 354-392.
- 8 James Finn, "Pacifism and Just War: Either or Neither," in Murnion, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-146.
- 9 Some moral theorists such as, for example, James Childress have argued that the presumption toward nonviolence in just-war theory means that even when the right to life is overruled for a just cause, the respect for the right must still be maintained in "moral traces of the right." This is an attempt to reread just-war theory in the consistent light of pacifism, but the exact meaning of these "moral traces" and how they can be respected in warfare is not very clear.
- 10 See Gene Sharp, *Exploring Non-Violent Alternatives* (Boston: Sargent, 1970).
- 11 See Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), p. 123. Note how this conservative feature of just-war thinking severely limits its usefulness in providing us help in building an international order of nations.
- 12 Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 130.
- 13 "The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response," in Murnion, *op. cit.*, p. 261. Italics mine.

For IV, by Thomas E. Clark S.J.

- 1 Decree 2, *Jesuits Today*, has an equally casual mention: ". . . so that by the gift of his love and grace they may build a peace based on justice" (no. 21). For an historical overview of GC 32 see John W. Padberg, S.J., "The Society True to Itself: A Brief History of the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus (December 2, 1974 - March 7, 1975),"

Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits, XV (May-September, 1983), Nos. 3 and 4.

- 2 This is not to suggest that peace did not concern the Latin American Church. The Medellin Conference of Latin American Bishops in 1968 devoted an entire document to the theme (see J. Gremillion, *The Gospel of Peace and Justice*, Maryknoll: Orbis, 1976, pp. 455-463). But the analysis is predominantly economic, and the arms race is dealt with cursorily and in a Latin American context.
- 3 Elsewhere I have offered some reflections on love, justice, and peace: "One Road to Peace: Tender Love, Firm Justice," *The Way*, 22 (July, 1982), 175-183.
- 4 The conference was published in *SJ Documentation*, No. 33, May 6, 1976.
- 5 The pertinent passage in *Octogesima Adveniens* reads: "It is up to Christian communities to analyze with objectivity the situation which is proper to their own country, to shed on it the light of the Gospel's unalterable words, and to draw principles of reflection, norms of judgment and directives for action from the social teaching of the Church" (Gremillion, p. 487).
- 6 See J. Holland and P. Henriot, *Social Analysis: Linking Faith and Justice*, revised and enlarged edition, (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1983), pp. 7-14. The pastoral circle was also a large factor in a project of the Woodstock Theological Center, which produced: J. Hug (ed.), *Tracing the Spirit: Communities, Social Action, and Theological Reflection* (New York: Paulist, 1983).
- 7 See P. Henriot, in *National Jesuit News*, February 1984.

RECENT BOOKS FROM THE INSTITUTE OF JESUIT SOURCES

These books are available now

Candido de Dalmases, S.J.

IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA,
FOUNDER OF THE JESUITS

His Life and Work

**The latest biography of St.
Ignatius in English.****Authoritative scholarship****Comprehensive perspective****Compact Ecumenical**

\$ 14.00 sewn paper

\$ 16.00 clothbound

Pedro Arrupe, S.J.

IN HIM ALONE IS OUR HOPE
TEXTS ON THE HEART OF CHRIST
(1965-1983)

Selected Letters and Addresses--IV

Foreword by Karl Rahner

**Father Arrupe's thought on the
Heart of Christ--devotional,
theological, and strategical.
He warmly shares much of his
interior life.**

\$ 6.00 glued paperback

\$ 7.00 sewn paperbound 178 pages

Carlos Valles

LIVING TOGETHER

in a Jesuit Community

**A "how-to-do-it" book, with
a sprightly style.****Is equally applicable to any
community, religious or lay,
and even to a family.****The author's books, best
sellers in India, have won
unusual popularity.**

\$ 4.00 sewn paper 128 pages

FORTHCOMING BOOKS FROM THE INSTITUTE OF JESUIT SOURCES
(Expected in late 1985 or early 1986)

Pedro Arrupe, S.J.

ONE JESUIT'S SPIRITUAL JOURNEY

Autobiographical Conversations
with Jean-Claude Dietsch, S.J.

Selected Letters and Addresses--V

Frankly reveals the functioning
of his mind, the spiritual principles
which guided him amid the
complexities of his generalship.

Important for the interpretation
of his initiatives and activities.

Reprints his address "Rooted and
Grounded in Love."

174 pages Price not yet set

Matteo Ricci, S.J. (1552-1610)

THE TRUE MEANING OF THE LORD
OF HEAVEN (Tien-chu Shih-i)

Translated, with Introduction
and Notes, by Douglas Lancashire
and Peter Hu Kuo-chen, S.J.

A Chinese-English edition, edited
by Edward J. Malatesta, S.J.

Ricci was a pioneer for the
inculturation of the faith and
in the effort to render into
Chinese such ideas as God, soul,
heaven, hell, angels.

This was his most influential
book for introducing Christianity
into China.

\$ 34.00 sewn paper
\$ 39.00 clothbound 500 pages

David M. Stanley, S.J.

"I ENCOUNTERED GOD!"
THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES
WITH THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

Both John and Ignatius could
say: "I encountered God!" This
book reveals the similarity of
their spiritual outlooks.

"The spirit of John is total-
ly love, and brings others to
love."

Biblical theology oriented
toward prayer.
Appendix on "prayerful reading"
of Scripture (lectio divina).

300+ pages Price not yet set

Josef Franz Schutte, S.J.

VALIGNANO'S MISSION PRINCIPLES
FOR JAPAN (1573-1582)

PART II: THE SOLUTION [of the
problem]: (1580-1582)

The problem facing Valignano,
superior of all Jesuit mis-
sions in the Far East, was to
mitigate the opinions of col-
leagues who thought lowly of
the natives and their culture.

He slowly formulated princi-
ples of adaptation to native
cultures. Thus he forged the
Jesuit missionary policies
later used so successfully by
Ricci, Di Nobili, and others.

\$ 14.00 sewn paper
\$ 16.00 clothbound 398 pages

Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University
3700 West Pine Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

(Please ENCIRCLE the BINDING desired)

TOTALS at
LIST PRICES

.....	► Arrupe, CHALLENGE TO RELIGIOUS LIFE TODAY: LETTERS & ADDRESSES — I	Cloth, \$7.00	Sewn paper, \$6.00
.....	► Arrupe, JUSTICE WITH FAITH TODAY: LETTERS & ADDRESSES — II	Cloth, \$8.00	Sewn paper, \$7.00
.....	► Arrupe, OTHER APOSTOLATES TODAY: LETTERS & ADDRESSES — III	Cloth, \$9.00	Sewn paper, \$8.00
.....	► Arrupe, IN HIM ALONE . . . TEXTS ON HEART OF CHRIST: LETTERS & ADDRESSES — IV	Sewn paper, \$7.00	Glued paper, \$6.00
.....	Bangert, A HISTORY OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS	Temporarily out of stock. Reprinting is in progress,		
.....	Bangert, BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY ON HISTORY OF SOCIETY OF JESUS	Sewn paper, \$2.50	Glued paper, \$1.50
.....	● Clancy, THE CONVERSATIONAL WORD OF GOD	Cloth, \$5.00	Sewn paper, \$2.50
.....	Clancy, INTRODUCTION TO JESUIT LIFE . . . THROUGH 435 YEARS	Cloth, \$12.00	
.....	CONFERENCES ON CHIEF DECREES OF GENERAL CONGREGATION 32	Sewn paper, \$4.50	Glued paper, \$3.50
.....	► Correia-Afonso, LETTERS FROM THE MUGHAL COURT (1580-1583)	Cloth, \$9.00	
.....	● Dalmases, ST. IGNATIUS, FOUNDER OF THE JESUITS: HIS LIFE AND WORK	Cloth about July I, \$16.00	Sewn paper, \$14. 00
.....	De Guibert, THE JESUITS: THEIR SPIRITUAL DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE
.....	► De Mello, SADHANA: A WAY TO GOD. CHRISTIAN EXERCISES IN EASTERN FORM		Glued paper, \$4.95
.....	DOCUMENTS OF GENERAL CONGREGATIONS 31 AND 32	Sewn paper, \$6.00	
.....	DOCUMENTS OF GENERAL CONGREGATION 33	Paper, \$3.00	
.....	Egan, SPIRITUAL EXERCISES AND IGNATIAN MYSTICAL HORIZON	Sewn paper, \$7.00	Glued paper, \$6.00
.....	● Fleming, SPIRITUAL EXERCISES: LITERAL TRANSLATION & CONTEMPORARY READING	Cloth, \$12.00	Sewn paper, \$8.50
.....	Fleming, A CONTEMPORARY READING OF THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES	Sewn paper, \$4.00	Glued paper, \$3.00
.....	Futrell, MAKING AN APOSTOLIC COMMUNITY OF LOVE	Sewn paper, \$5.00	Glued paper, \$4.00
.....	Ganss, JESUIT EDUCATIONAL TRADITION AND ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY	Cloth, \$3.25	
.....	Gruenberg, LABOR PEACEMAKER: LIFE & WORKS OF LEO C. BROWN, S.J.	Cloth, \$8.50	Sewn paper, \$7.00	Glued paper, \$6.00
.....	Ignatius, St., CONSTITUTIONS OF SJ: INTRO, TRANS., COMMENTARY by G. E. Ganss	Sewn paper, \$12.00	
.....	Iparraguirre, BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ORIENTATIONS ON CONSTITUTIONS OF THE S.J.		Glued paper, \$1.60
.....	JESUIT RELIGIOUS LIFE TODAY		Glued paper, \$3.00
.....	McCabe, INTRODUCTION TO THE JESUIT THEATER	Sewn paper, \$19.00	
.....	● Pousset, LIFE IN FAITH & FREEDOM — FESSARD'S DIALECTIC	Cloth, \$9.00	Sewn paper, \$8.00	Glued paper, \$7.00
.....	● Schütte, VALIGNANO'S MISSION PRINCIPLES FOR JAPAN, Vol. I, Part I	Cloth, \$14.00	Sewn paper, \$12.00
.....	Toner, COMMENTARY ON IGNATIUS' RULES FOR THE DISCERNMENT OF SPIRITS	Cloth, \$14.00	Sewn paper, \$11.00
.....	► Valles, LIVING TOGETHER IN A JESUIT COMMUNITY	Sewn paper, \$4.00	
.....	Wulf (ed.), IGNATIUS: HIS PERSONALITY AND SPIRITUAL HERITAGE		Glued paper, \$7.00

NAME

DISCOUNTS:

On orders of \$30.00 or more: 10%
On orders of \$60.00 or more: 20%

TOTAL at LIST prices

Subtract discount, if any

ADDRESS

★ Postage and handling

\$1.25

CITY, STATE, & ZIP

Amount to be paid

★ This may be OMITTED on PREPAID orders of \$30.00 or over at LIST prices

► For sale by us ONLY in North America.

● For sale by us ONLY in the First World (Americas, Europe, Australia, N. Zealand).

PAST ISSUES, with Abbreviated Titles

PRICE: \$.75 each. Double issues, \$1.50

- OL I, NO. 1 (Sept 1969). J.R.Sheets. Profile of the Contemporary Jesuit.
- I,2 (Nov 1969). G.E.Ganss. The Authentic Sp.Exercises: History & Terminology.
- I,1 (Feb 1970). W.J.Burke. Institution and Person.
- I,2 (Apr 1970). J.C.Futrell. Ignatian Discernment.
- I,3 (Sept 1970). B.Lonergan. The Jesuit as Priest and Apostle.
- II,1 (Feb 1971). J.H.Wright. Grace of Our Founder and of Our Vocation.
- II,2 (Apr 1971). V.J.O'Flaherty. Reflections on Jesuit Commitment.
- II,3 (Jun 1971). T.E.Clarke. Jesuit Commitment, Fraternal Covenant? J.C. Haughey, New Perspective on Commitment.
- II,4 (Sept 1971). J.Toner. A Method for Communal Discernment of God's Will.
- II,5 (Nov 1971). J.R.Sheets. Toward a Theology of Religious Life.
- IV,1 (Jan 1972). D.B.Knight. St. Ignatius' Ideal of Poverty.
- IV,2 (Mar 1972). Discussion: (1) Spiritual Direction. (2) Leadership & Authority.
- IV,3 (Jun 1972). L.Orsy. Purpose and Scope of the General Congregation.
- IV,4 (Oct 1972). Continuity & Change. Ganss, Wright, O'Malley, O'Donovan, Dulles.
- IV,5 (Nov 1972). J.C.Futrell. Comm. Discernment: Reflections on Experience.
- V,1 & 2 (Jan & Mar 1973). V.J.O'Flaherty. Renewal: Call & Response. \$ 1.50.
- V,3 (Mar 1973). Pedro Arrupe & C.J.McNaspy. The Place of Art in Jesuit Life.
- V,4 (Jun 1973). J.C.Haughey. The Pentecostal Thing and Jesuits.
- V,5 (Oct 1973). L.Orsy. Toward Theological Evaluation of Communal Discernment.
- VI, 1 & 2 (Jan & Mar 1973). J.W.Padberg. History of Gen. Congregations SJ. \$1.50
- VI,3 (Apr 1974). D.B.Knight. Joy & Judgment in Religious Obedience.
- VI,4 (Jun 1974). J.J.Toner. Commentary on the Deliberation of the First Fathers.
- VI,5 (Oct 1974). R.L.Schmitt. The Christ-Experience & Relationship in the SpEx.
- VII,1 (Jan 1975). On Thinking with the Church Today. Wright, Ganss, Orsy.
- VII,2 (Mar 1975). Ganss. Sodalities and Christian Life Communities.
- VII,3 (Jun, 1975). W.J.Connolly. Contemporary Spiritual Direction: Principles.
- VII,4 (Sept 1975). T.E.Clarke. Ignatian Spirituality & Social Consciousness. OP L.Orsy. Faith & Justice: Reflections.
- VII,5 (Nov 1975). M.J.Buckley. Confirmation of Promise. J.W.Padberg. Contin- and Change in Gen. Congregation XXXII.
- VIII,1 (Jan 1976). C.E.O'Neill. Acata- miento: Ignatian Reverence.
- VIII,2 & 3 (Mar & May 1976). Symposium: Evangelical Poverty. De la Costa, Sher- idan, & others. \$ 1.50.
- VIII,4 (Oct 1976). R.L.Faricy. Jesuit Community: Community of Prayer.
- VIII,5 (Dec 1976). M.J.Buckley. Jesuit Priesthood: Meaning & Commitments.
- IX,1 & 2 (Jan & Mar 1977). J.E. Becker. Changes in Jesuit Membership, 1958-75. Discussions by others. \$ 1.50.
- IX,3 (May, 1977) R.F.Harvanek. The Reluc- tance to Admit Sin.
- IX,4 (Sept 1977). W.J.Connolly & P.Land. Jesuit Spiritualities & Social Justice.
- IX,5 (Nov 1977). J.J.Gill. A Jesuit's Account of Conscience.
- X,1 (Jan 1978). A.C.Kammer. "Burn-Out"-- Dilemma for the Jesuit Social Activist.
- X,2 & 3 (March & May 1978). Affectivity & Sexuality. W.A.Barry, Madeline Birmingham, W.J.Connolly, R.J.Fahey, Virginia Finn, J.J.Gill. \$ 1.50. OP
- X,4 (Sept 1978). R.F.Harvanek. Status of Obedience in the Society of Jesus.
- X,5 (Nov 1978). J.W.Padberg. Experience & the Sp. Exercises: Example of Ignatius.
- XI,1 (Jun 1979). T.H.Clancy. Feeling Bad about Feeling Good.
- XI,2 (Mar 1979). D.Maruca. Our Personal Witness as Power to Evangelize Culture.
- XI,3 (May 1979). J.L.Klein. American Jesuits and the Liturgy.
- XI,4 (Sept 1979). M.J.Buckley. Mission in Companionship. **Supply Exhausted.**
- XI,5 (Nov 1979). J.F.Conwell. The Kamikaze Factor: Choosing Ministries.

- XII,1 (Jan 1980). T.H.Clancy. Veteran Witnesses: Their Experiences of Jes. Life.
- XII,2 (Mar 1980). P.J.Henriot, J.Apple-
yard, J.L.Klein. Small Communities.
- XII,3 (May 1980). J.F.Conwell. Living and
Dying in the Society of Jesus.
- XII, 4 & 5 (Sept & Nov 1980) Schineller.
Newer Approaches to Christology & Their
Use in the Sp Exercises. \$ 1.50.
- XIII,1 (Jan 1981). Simon Peter. Alcohol-
ism in Jesuit Life.
- XIII,2 (Mar 1981). P.Begheyn. A Bibliog-
raphy on the Spiritual Exercises.
- XIII,3 (May,1981). G.E.Ganss. The Jesuit
Brothers' Vocation & Its Documentation.
- XIII,4 (Sept 1981). J.W.Reites. St. Igna-
tius and the Jews.
- XIII,5 (Nov 1981). D.J.O'Brien. The
Jesuits and Catholic Higher Education.
- XIV,1 (Jan 1982). J.W.O'Malley. The Jes-
uits, Ignatius & Counter Reformation.
- XIV,2 (Mar 1982). Avery Dulles. St. Igna-
tius & Jesuit Theological Tradition.
- XIV,3 (May 1982). P.Robb. Conversion as a
Human Experience.
- XIV,4 (Sept 1982). H.J.Gray. An Experi-
ence in Ignatian Government.
- XIV,5 (Sept 1982). F.Ivern. The Future of
Faith and Justice.
- XV,1 (Jan 1983). J.W.O'Malley. The Fourth
Vow in Its Ignatian Context.
- XV,2 (Mar 1983). F.Sullivan & R.Faricy.
The Sp Ex for Renewal of Jes Charisms.
- XV,3 & 4 (May & Sept 1983). J.W.Padberg.
History of General Congregation XXXII.
- XV,5 & XVI,1 (Nov '83 & Jan '84). J.Tet-
low. Jesuits' Mission in Higher Educa-
tion: Perspectives & Contexts. \$ 1.50.
- XVI,2 (Mar 1984). J.W. O'Malley. To
Travel...Nadal on Jesuit Vocation.
- XVI,3 (May 1984). D.J.O'Hanlon. Integra-
tion: A Western Christian Looks East. OP
- XVI,4 (Sept 1984). G.I.Carlson. A Spir-
ituality of Continuing Formation.
- XVI,5 (Nov 1984). E.E.Kinerk. Place of
Great Desires in Jesuit Spirituality.
- XVII,1 (Jan 1985). W.C.Spohn. St. Paul
on Apostolic Celibacy.
- XVII,2 (March 1985). B.E.Daley. "In Ten
Thousand Places:" Christian Universal-
ity and the Jesuit Mission.
- XVII,3 (May 1985). J.E.Tetlow. Dialogue
on the Sexual Maturing of Celibates.
- XVII,4 (Sept 1985). Jesuits and Peace-
making. W.C.Spohn, J.A.Coleman, T.E.
Clarke, P.J.Henriot.



THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, FUSZ MEMORIAL
3700 WEST PINE BLVD.

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63108
Assistancy Seminar: (314) 652-5737
Fusz Memorial: (314) 652-3700

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND PRICES, beginning July 1, 1982

I: To Persons OTHER THAN JESUIT MEMBERS of the American Assistancy

These *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* are published by this Seminar. Naturally, they are focused on Jesuit problems and interests. But others who find these essays helpful are cordially welcome to read them.

THE PRICES

Constantly rising costs, especially for postage outside the U.S., force us with regret to raise our subscription prices. After July 1, 1982, they will be:

Per SINGLE COPY, 75 cents. (Double issues, \$1.50)

SUBSCRIPTIONS:	DOMESTIC	OUTSIDE THE U.S.A., surface mail
	\$4.50 for 1 year, \$9.00 for 2	\$8 for 1 year; \$16 for 2 years

FOREIGN AIR MAIL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Checks using foreign money (e.g., francs) must add \$1 for bank fees and exchange.	\$10 for 1 year in Central America; \$20 for 2 years \$14 in Europe, South America, Mediterranean Africa \$28 for 2 years \$16 in Asia, Africa, Pacific regions; \$32 for 2 years
--	--

ALL REQUESTS FOR SUBSCRIPTIONS, RENEWALS, AND CHANGES OF ADDRESS

should be mailed to: *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*
from THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR

(Payment should accompany all requests for subscriptions or renewals)
Circulation Department
Post Office Box 6148
Duluth, Minnesota 55806

REQUESTS for SINGLE COPIES or PAST ISSUES should be mailed to:

(Please add 75 cents for shipping)
The American Assistancy Seminar
Fusz Memorial
3700 West Pine Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

II. To JESUIT MEMBERS of the American Assistancy

Copies of these *Studies* are mailed to you by means of labels prepared by National Jesuit News, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia, PA 19131.

REQUESTS for CHANGES OF ADDRESS should be sent there. Your FORMER address and your new one are both necessary.

An exception: U.S. Jesuits LIVING OUTSIDE THE U.S. should send such requests for change of address here to the Assistancy Seminar, in St. Louis.

Most PAST ISSUES are available.

See the opposite page for a LIST OF THE TITLES

The American Assistancy Seminar
Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University
3700 West Pine Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID

St. Louis, Missouri
Permit No. 2541

Serials Department
Bapst Library
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

PROPERTY OF O'NEILL LIBRARY BOSTON COLLEGE

